IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 913

International Court of Justice

H0913 – 0001

H0913-0002

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

FRIDAY, 24 MAY 1946

COMMISSIONERS:

Colonel A. M. S. Neave
M. Martin Havard

THE S. D.

(The Commission convened at 1000 hours.)

ALFRED HELMUT NAUJOCKS -- Resumed

CROSS EXAMINATION -- Continued

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q You told me yesterday that you had seen a copy of a document in prison?

A I don't believe that it was a document.

Q Well, when I say a document I don't want there to be any mystery about what the document was. Was that the document you saw?

A Yes, I believe it was this kind in German.

Q That appears to have been a copy of the trial brief of the Gestapo. On what date was it that you saw that?

A That I can't say. I don't remember that part.

Q Was it long ago or was it quite recently?

A I don't remember when I saw it, since I am very interested in any kind of papers that were permitted to come over to our section.

Q But was it a week ago or was it two months ago?

H0913 - 0003

A With certainty I can not say.

Q Well, you must be able to tell me approximately how long ago it was when you saw this document?

A I don't suppose that you ever were in prison and that you have no idea of time.

Q Was it before Christmas or since Christmas?

A Since Christmas.

Q I am going to ask you again and if you refuse to tell me again we can't go any further. Can you say approximately whether it was a week, a month, two months or three months ago that you saw this document?

DR. GAWLIK: I object to this question. I do not think that this question is relevant.

COLONEL NEAVE: I wonder if you can state briefly what is the object of your question? Defense Counsel are rather ~~liberal as to~~ anxious concerning the documents that they have been given permission to hand out to witnesses, but I don't think they have any connection with your question.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: I am prepared to say, at this particular time, that I am making no objection at all to the fact of his seeing this or any other document.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, that should satisfy you, I think, ~~for the present.~~ Dr Gawlik.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Now, are you prepared to tell me when it was you first saw this document?

A I can not tell you when; I only can tell you whether

H0913-0004

it was this or that document if you show it to me.

Q You realized, did you not, before your interrogation in November, that the SD were indicted as a criminal organization?

A I would like to answer this question explicitly if I may.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Surely he should be able to answer yes or not to that question.

A I can't do that because I have to answer it explicitly.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Did you know or did you not that the SD was indicted as a criminal organization before your interrogation in November?

A I, for my part, only considered the leadership of the SD as a criminal group, but not the organization as such. By that I mean Himmler and the Gleiwitz episode concerning Heydrich, about which I made these statements.

Q I am not asking you what you consider. I am asking you whether you knew that the organization as a whole had been indicted as criminal?

A T At that time, no. I did not think about it.

Q Then when were you told or when did you find out that the organization as a whole had been indicted as criminal?

A Twelve weeks after the 10th of September I came into the witness wing of the prison and there heard for the first time that the organization, as such, probably would be indicted.

H0913-0005

Q And have you since then, together with the other prisoners in the witness wing, been inventing some kind of defense for the SD?

A I did not make inventions but I just took the point of view of telling the whole truth and my conviction.

Q Was it only necessary to tell the whole truth after you found that by what you had said in your affidavit you had incriminated the SD?

A I made this statement, which was the basis of the sworn affidavit of the 20th of November, 1945, at a time when Hitler and Himmler were still alive. My statement or indic t-ment, which I made freely on my own part, I make against Himmler and Hitler.

Q You knew perfectly well, did you not, in November, that Himmler was dead and that Hitler was dead?

A Yes, of course I knew that, but the basis for my sworn affidavit were statements which I had made earlier.

Q (By Colonel Neave) You mean you had made a previous statement?

A I made statements earlier and I had to verify these by this sworn affidavit, since I had made them previously.

Q (Colonel Griffith Jones) Well, I won't pursue that. When you learned that you had been inaccurate in your affi-davits about the SD men, what did you do about it? Who did you tell?

A As soon as I realized that, I volunteered as a witness for the defense of the SD.

H0913 - 0006

Q Did nobody suggest that you might come and give evidence for the SD?

A It was a matter of course that I had to, since I was on one side, the part of the prosecution against the SD, that I had to also defend the SD due to the fact that my statement was misunderstood by the prosecution.

Q Very well. Now I want to ask you about another matter. When you made the affidavit on the 20th of November that we have seen, you did, in fact, make two other affidavits as well, did you not?

A I don't know for sure but I believe I made two all together.

Q Would you look at this document? Does that bear your signature on it?

A Yes.

Q Is that an affidavit sworn to on the 20th of November?

A Yes.

Q Did you say this -- and I quote from Paragraph 2 -- and this was during September, 1938: "While in Hof, which is on the Czech border, I repeated visits to the SD Service Department that is, Intelligence Office, which has been extended I beg your pardon, I ought to start this again. I will start from the beginning of paragraph 1: "In September 1938 I was working in Amt III of the SD. (The department which was then called Amt III later became Amt VI.) In the course of my work I traveled between Berlin, Hof and Munich." Does that appear in your affidavit?

H0913-0007

A Yes.

Q "While in Hof, which is on the Czech border, I paid repeated visits to the SD Service Department, that is, Intelligence Office, which has been established there. This Service Department had the task of collecting all political intelligence emanating from the Czechoslovak border districts and passing it on to Berlin. Continuous day and night teleprinter communications had been established from Hof direct to Amt III of the SD in Berlin."

I now will pass to Paragraph 5. "Hof was the center for all intelligence collected by the SD on the Czechoslovak question. The SD had agents all along the border in every town. The names of these agents were reported to Hof, and two motor cars toured the border every day to collect the intelligence which had been unearthed. In addition, I remember that two or three companies of the SS-Totenkopf units were stationed in the neighborhood of Asch."

Now will you look at this document. Does that document bear your signature?

A Yes.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: We are ready to put these documents in and give them a number?

COLONEL NEAVE: This is one of his affidavits, isn't it?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: And it has not been exhibited before at all?

H0913-0008

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: No.

COLONEL NEAVE: We haven't really discussed it yet, the question of putting in documents before this Commission.

DR. GAWLIK: Then may I ask that I get copies of these documents if they will be used?

COLONEL NEAVE: I think, Colonel Griffith Jones, that before we start putting in documents we must agree on some system by which the defense and ourselves get copies. We haven't really gone into this subject yet at all. Would you prefer to wait and talk that over later before putting in that document?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: ~~If~~ We might adopt the same procedure as is adopted before the Tribunal during cross examination, and that is that when the prosecution puts in a document, defense counsel are either given copies at the time or immediately thereafter. I suggest that might be a satisfactory arrangement.

COLONEL NEAVE: How long is this document? Would it take long to translate or is it already in German, the copy?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: That copy I have handed ~~him~~ the witness is in German. It could be handed to Dr. Gawlik ~~Gawkik~~ and I could get another copy.

COLONEL NEAVE: Dr. Gawkik, if you take a copy of that document now, will you agree to this procedure providing we number these documents?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: And you will establish a numbering system?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Well, I would suggest that the Commission establish the numbering system.

H0913-0009

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, I mean the prosecution.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes. Very well, I can do it by conferring with the Court Secretary. I will have to get a block of numbers which we can use.

COLONEL NEAVE: Hmm, Shall we deal with that afterwards?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: The only fear I have is that unless we do number these documents as we go along we will get confused, so perhaps we could simply call this Prosecution's Document No. 1.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, we will arrange the numbering system afterwards. In the meantime, if Dr. Gawlik agrees to this procedure --

DR. GAWLIK: Of course, if this system is used, the Defense too will bring before this Commission sworn affidavits and I hope that there is no objection to that.

COLONEL NEAVE: There is no objection to that. They can do that.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Is that document, No. 2, which I have just handed you, another affidavit sworn to by yourself on the 20th of November?

A Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let me explain to Dr. Gawlik that Colonel Griffith Jones is going to read this copy and then he can have the copy.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q I will read the first paragraph: "From 1934 to 1941 I was a member of the SD. In the winter of 1939 I was stationed

H0913-0010

in Berlin, working in Amt VI, Chief Sector South East. Early in March, 1939, four or five days before Slovakia declared its independence, Heydrich, who was chief of the SD, ordered me to report to Nebe, the chief of the Reich Criminal Police. Nebe had been told by Heydrich to accelerate the production of explosives which his department was manufacturing for the use of certain Slovak groups. These explosives were small tins weighing approximately 500 grams. As soon as forty or fifty of these explosives had been finished, I carried them by automobile to a small village called Engerau, just across the border from Pressburg in Slovakia. The Security Police had a Service Department in this village for the handling of SD activities." When did you realized that you had made an error in your affidavit by talking about SD men and that that phrase incriminated the SD, did you discover any error in what you had said in these two affidavits?

A No. According to my opinion, there was nothing criminal in this representation.

Q If you had been told that what you said in these two affidavits incriminated the SD, would you have been prepared to think out some other explanation to come and give to this Commission?

A There is no possibility of excusing the SD in this case because the prosecution knows that I know -- they have full information as to what the leadership, the Chief of the Security Office and the SD had done to me. I have to make a difference, though, between the leadership and the organization, which had

H0913-0011

nothing to do with it.

COLONEL NEAVE: May I just interrupt one minute? This witness really is speaking much too fast. It is very difficult for the court reporters to follow.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q I don't want to interrupt you but we will go on and if you want to add any further explanation you may do so when I have finished. I have one further question to ask you which may shorten what you are going to say. On the 12th of September, last year, you were interrogated by Colonel Brundage, were you not? Perhaps I might read to you a passage from a transcript of your interrogation on that date. You were talking of the work you were doing, fighting the black market in Belgium in 1944, and then you speak of your surrender to the Allies and this is what you have said: "That is why I went voluntarily in October ---"

DR. GAWLIK: I object to that. The relevancy here is only questions concerning the activities, duties and actions of the various organizations. Paragraph 4 of the letter of the 13th of March is irrelevant.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: If Dr. Gawlik will allow me to finish reading six lines he will find that this passage affects the activities and aims of the organization.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let Colonel Griffith Jones finish his reading then.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: "That is why I went voluntarily

H0913 - 0012

in 1944 over to the Allies, because I knew that after we had to retreat from Belgium, after the war situation, the SS would have got me. I knew that because already twice before the SD had tried to get me and give me different tasks, but I didn't want to go back to the SS under any circumstances; so then I went over the border to the Allies."

Now on the 9th of October you went further to explain why you did not want to go back to the SS, and I quote now from the transcript of your interrogation of that date: "Normally, now that the job had been terminated, I should have reported to the SS Administrator in order to obtain a new assignment, but I knew that all I would get would be an assignment for more dirty work and I did not want to do that."

And again on the 10th of October, did you say this: "I could be sure that Himmler would again give me some dirty job with the Security Police"?

A Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: Colonel Griffith Jones, are this man's adventures eventually going to relate to the activities of the SD?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes, that is the evidence that the SD and the SS were employing this man for dirty work.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Is that correct?

A May I now explain this?

Q Yes.

A The statements of the prosecution prove clearly that

H0913-0013

I have no reason to be thankful to the leadership of the Security Service for the SD since I had nothing but trouble through them. It also proves that with the word "SD" I always meant all the organizations that are connected with the Security Service. At that time I did not specify these differences which are necessary today, and the dirty jobs of which I was afraid, I did not receive from the organization but from Himmler himself and the Chief of the German Security Police, Kaltenbrunner.

Q AND did you use the comprehensive term "SD" because all organizations connected with the Security Police were working in the closest cooperation with one another?

A No, I used it as a shortcut. The word "SD", just the word "SD" is used for Internal Security Detachment.

COLONEL NEAVE: Before the next Prosecutor starts to cross examine, I would like to make an announcement regarding witnesses for the Gestapo.

(Discussion off the record.)

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q In September, 1939, the SD reorganized and certain tasks of ~~the~~ Amt III were transferred to Amt VI, isn't that so?

DR. GAWLIK: I object to questions of the reorganization. I have another witness on that and I fear that the answers of the other witness which I have concerning the SD will be declared irrelevant.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, first of all, I am not clear as to the import of your question. Maybe I didn't understand it.

H0913 — 0014

M. MONNERAY: I wanted to know whether, in September of 1939, certain tasks of Amt III were transferred to the office of Amt VI.

May I answer objection of counsel? Since the witness has been a member of Amt III, according to his testimony, I think it is perfectly permissible to ask him any questions about the organization of which he was a member. Besides, afterwards he was a member of Amt VI also, so that he would be a direct witness on certain questions for the organization of which he was a member.

COLONEL NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, you asked him questions yourself on this subject of Amt III so I don't see why the prosecution should not cross examine him on that. So far as the question of what the next witness is going to say, if it is cumulative to what he has said, well, I will leave that to you. I think you discussed Amt III yourself.

DR. GAWLIK: But I only discussed it as far as the witness was concerned and also only as far as the case Kleiwidz. As far as I know, the witness was never in the German Signal Service or the Information Service within the country but always outside the country and, therefore, I doubt very much whether he can give information about the Information branch inside Germany.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, M. Monneray, will you keep this as short as possible and then we will find out whether he really does know anything.

M. MONNERAY: Yes.

H0913-0015

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q Witness, what was the designation for Department ~~&x~~ VI S ~~&x&~~ of Amt VI?

A At the time I belonged to Amt VI the designation Amt VI S did not exist and evidently was brought about only much later.

Q What was the meaning of Amt VI?

A I only can give information about Amt VI until January 1941.

Q But you just said just now that afterwards you know that Amt VI S was brought about?

A Yes. It was a branch which, so far as I heard, was only made up for war purposes.

Q Is it right that the mission of Amt VI S was sabotage, according to Document 2346 PS. I do not have the exhibit Number.

COLONEL NEAVE: M. Monneray, what document is being referred to? Is that a document that has been put in by the prosecution?

M. MONNERAY: Yes, the document has been put in but I don't know what the number is.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, I don't think we can expect the witness to remember what it is by the number.

M. MONNERAY: Well, I will show him the document.

A I only heard of the existence of Amt VI~~&~~ S and whatever I say about it are just opinions of my own for which I am not responsible. I only know about the activity of Amt VI S from

H0913-0016

one case and am not able to give the complete scope of work of that office. Therefore, I can not make any responsible answers concerning the scope of work by that office.

Q You suggest in your answer that you knew about the existence of this office when you got the special mission from Himmler for Denmark?

A That is the one case that I was talking about just now.

Q What did this special mission for Denmark consist of?

A This mission was for me to work as anti-terrorist, to do anti-terrorist activities against the Danish partisans or the Danish resistance movement.

COLONEL NEAVE: Just a minute, M. Monneray. Do you think that this is very relevant, this reference to his individual mission to Denmark?

M. MONNERAY: I think this mission is not an individual mission; I was just coming to the general task of the organization.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, go on.

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q What were the particular measures to take in Denmark against the resistance movement?

A We always did that but on the smallest scale, what the Danish resistance movement had shown us.

Q What did you do in Denmark?

A We answered the Danish resistance movement with the same measures that they used against German interests.

COLONEL NEAVE: Just a minute, M. Monneray. I am still

H0913-0017

not quite clear what this is leading to. We do want to save time. What has this mission to Denmark got to do with the SD?

M. MONNERAY: The SD had special missions sent into occupied territory in order to fight against the resistance movements. Those missions were --

COLONEL NEAVE: Did this man say he was sent there on behalf of the SD?

M. MONNERAY: He was sent over by Himmler. He said he was not sent alone to Denmark; he was in a group. And he said also that he considered these measures taken in Denmark as a certain kind of reprisals so he got superior orders for the execution of those orders in Denmark. So this action, with the actions of his accomplices, was a political action of the German organizations.

H0913 - 0018

DR. GAWLIK: Himmler had a large number of organizations. Himmler was chief of the SD, was chief of the Police, he was commander of the Replacement Army. The fact that the witness had received the job from Himmler, therefore, does not prove anything concerning the organization. The prosecution also stated that the group took part, but up to now no mention was made as to the group of the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: Thank you, Dr. Gawlik. I ~~withdraw the~~ sustain this objection, I heard no reference so far as to the SD on the mission to Denmark. I cannot see the reference in this discussion. I think you should make your questions a little more ~~precise~~ clear. Will you go on, Mr. Monneray?

MR. MONNERAY: I would like to know first which were the action measures taken in Denmark?

DR. GAWLIK: That is the same question.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let the witness answer. He may say whether or not he knows about this. Please repeat the question.

MR. MONNERAY: What were the measures carried through by the witness and other people working with him in Denmark, according to the orders of Himmler?

THE WITNESS: Only always in answer to the measures that the Danes made against us.

(RECESS.)

COLONEL NEAVE: Will you continue, Mr. Monneray?

MR. MONNERAY: When were you in Denmark?

DR. GAWLIK: I object to further questioning concerning the incident in Denmark, as long as the question has not been settled whether these questions concern the actions of Amp. 3 - 6 or 7.

COLONEL NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, I believe we should listen to what the witness has to say.

H0913-0019

BY MR. MONNERAY:

Q When were you in Denmark?

A I was in Denmark in 1944.

Q Were you long in Denmark?

A During each visit I was there only a short time, I was there three or four times just a few days and I can only give very restricted information about this.

Q With whom were you in contact in Denmark, insofar as German authorities are concerned?

A May I ask a question in explanation as to the organization?

COLONEL NEAVE: ~~No, only~~ Answer the question.

BY MR. MONNERAY:

A I was in touch with people whose names I do not remember exactly and about whom I do not know, nor do I know if the names given me were their real names or not.

Q At what location did you get in touch with those German people?

A I took up discussions with the manager or director of Amp. 6, a man called Skorceny. I told the prosecution when I was asked about this some time ago that the people, like Skorceny, were people belonging to the army and not to the SD.

Q May I make this question clear? Before you went to Denmark, you were told to contact Skorceny, chief of Amp 6-S, is that so?

A There was no such thing as Amp 6-S.

Q Did you not say just before the recess, at the beginning that you did not know anything about the office of Amp 6?

A I said with one exception and this exception is Denmark.

Q Could you tell us the important sense of the conversation you had with Skorceny?

H0913 - 0020

A I received an order.

Q Did you ever see Skorceny before?

A Skorceny was not authorized to give me orders. I should like to point out that I was not a member of the SD when Himmler gave me this mission.

Q Why did you see Skorceny?

A Because I did not belong to the SD and as far as I was concerned I did not have a single person at my disposal to help me carry out my orders.

Q Did Skorceny give you any personnel in order to help you to carry through your special task?

A Yes, he did, but these people did not belong to the SD, but to a troop section of the Waffen SS.

Q So, Skorceny did give you personnel?

A Yes, personnel from the Waffen SS.

Q Why did you go to Skorceny and get this help?

A Because those were Kaltenbrunner's orders.

Q Did you tell Skorceny that you got your orders from Kaltenbrunner?

A Yes.

Q Kaltenbrunner was Chief over Skorceny?

A Kaltenbrunner was Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q So, Skorceny had to carry out the orders transmitted by you from Kaltenbrunner?

A I cannot give you any clear answer to that question, as even today I do not know what the status of Skorceny was and if he belonged to the Waffen SS or the SD.

Q Was Department 6-S part of Amp. 6?

A In my opinion there is only one.

Q Six was a part of the SD? Was it?

H0913-0021

A Yes.

Q How many people did you get from Skorceny?

A I, personally, did not get any men. These men were led by a man and they were subordinate to the Waffen SS. They were a troop part of the Waffen SS.

Q Your group did not carry out any killings of people?

A In my estimation about one-twentieth of the number of German soldiers killed by the Danes. I can only give an estimate, as I have no definite knowledge.

Q Your answer is "yes?"

A I have already given my answer.

Q Did you meet Dr. Mildner in Denmark?

A No.

Q Could you give me the names of any German officers in Denmark with whom you had been in touch?

A Yes, but not in relation to these things. I do not know what the question is to mean.

Q That is all.

COLONEL NEAVE: Does the Russian prosecution desire to ask any questions?

RUSSIAN PROSECUTOR: No.

BY LT. COLONEL BROOKHART:

Q I have a few questions pertaining to the examination by the council for the Gestapo. If I understood you correctly, you stated that no part of Amp 4 RSHA was used in preparing the simulated attack against the Gleiwitz Radio Station?

H0913-0022

A I said that no member of Amp. 4 took part in the attack on the Gleiwitz Radio Station.

Q Is it not true that Mildner, chief of the Gestapo, directed you in part in this task and that you reported to Mueller at his station in Oppen where he instructed you on when and where you would receive the body of the dead man to be used as part of this simulated attack?

A Yes, I said that Mildner was to give me an order that had passed on, that Heydrick was to give an order passed on by Mildner, as to the body of the dead man. I carried through this action without help.

Q But, you did receive the body, according to the plan arranged by Mildner?

A Yes, it was given to me as an order.

Q The question was whether the body was furnished pursuant to arrangements made by Mueller?

A I can give you no precise answer. I was only a witness to a conversation between Mildner and Mueller. I can give you no definite answer as to the part Amp. 4 played in it.

Q This is the substance of what you testified to before, is it not? You had a conversation with Mueller sometime before the incident, you had previous instructions to call Mueller when you wanted the dead body, using the words "For Canned Goods." Mueller told you you would receive the body at exactly eight o'clock at the broadcasting station in Gleiwitz. You chose the point at which the body was to be delivered. When the signal was given you did receive the man and you laid him down at the entrance of the station. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Those are the facts?

H0913 - 0023

A Yes, but I cannot place Mueller in direct touch or contact with Amp. 4.

Q What you say now and have said before is your answer to the best of your recollection, is that correct?

A Yes.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Will you please answer my questions only by answering "yes" or "no" and if I want a declaration, I will ask you for same. If you do not know anything for certain, say you do not know for certain.

The first question relates to the word "SD Man". Does the word "SD Man" mean a man who is on duty in the Intelligence Service in Germany proper - an office which was later carried on by Office 3 of the RSHA?

A No.

Q What does "SD Man" mean? I shall word my question this way, did the word "SD Man" have several different meaning in the language?

COLONEL NEAVE: I thought the witness had already answered this question in the original examination.

DR. GAWLIK: In my opinion, these questions have not been answered quite clearly. May I present the question to the witness in my interpretation of what he has said?

COLONEL NEAVE: Let us have a brief statement as to what the term "SD Man" means, according to the witness.

DR. GAWLIK: I understand the term "SD Man" has several different meanings. First, a man who was on duty in the Inland Intelligence Service, carried out by the organization of Amp. 3. A further meaning of the term, "SD Man" was a man who was active in the Foreign Intelligence Service outside

H0913 - 0024

of Germany proper, an organization taken over later by Amp. 6. The"SD Man" was further mentioned as members of Amp. 7. That is the meaning of the term applied to "SD Man" according to the bureaus in which they worked. Furthermore, there was an SD of the SS, together with all the members of the RSHA and the members of the SS, or who wanted to become members of the SS, especially also members of the Gestapo and the Criminal Police. These so-called "SD Men" have one principle, nothing to do with these specialists. There are four different meanings for the term "SD Man." Furthermore you said that according to Heydrich, the term "SD Man" was also used for a man who was termed as "confidential" or "reliable." If I understood you correctly, you said there were many different meanings for the term "SD Man". Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

LT. COLONEL BROOKHART: This is much too complicated for a single question, at least it cannot be answered in a single answer. A further objection would be that it covers a period during which the witness said he was not a member of the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: He has given quite a clear explanation of what he understands what the witness has said of the interpretion of the term, "SD Man". The witness has answered that it is the correct version. I think this has done something to clarify the nature of the term "SD Man." However, Dr. Gawlik, I don't think you should continue in that form, I think you must ask the witness short questions.

DR. GAWLIK: I only put the question in this form, as the witness did not at first understand my question.

COLONEL NEAVE: Go ~~ahead~~ on.

H0913-0025

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Do you mean to say that the reason for your using the word "SD Man" from a different sense used by the prosecution is due to your different meaning of the word "SD Man?"

A Yes, this is what I tried to explain to the Tribunal yesterday.

Q You did not want to deny that you made use of the term, "SD Man?"

A No.

Q I now refer to the affidavit of 20 November, 1945. This is affidavit for the prosecution No. 1. You said in September, 1938 you worked in Amp. 3. Did this Amp. 3 of the SD have the same aims and objectives of the later Amp 3 of the RSHA?

A No, it had nothing whatsoever to do with them. The exact name of the office at that time was not Amp. 3, it was Central Department No. 3.

Q You further said that you visited an SD - Service Department. Was this a department that had the same tasks, aims and objectives of the latter Amp 3 of the RSHA?

A No, it was a department that concerned itself with counter intelligence matters.

Q Did this office have any special aims, or was its activities concerning counter intelligence matters and espionage such as all countries have?

MR. MONNERAY: I don't think the witness can answer any questions concerning foreign matters or countries.

COLONEL NEAVE: Please keep to the point.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Were you employed in the German Intelligence Service abroad?

H0913-0026

A Yes.

Q In your capacity as a member of Amt 6 were you able to get an insight into the foreign espionage agencies of other countries?

A I am quite well informed concerning the espionage agencies in the Balkans, but I am not informed as to the American and English intelligence service.

Q Could you make a comparison...?

DR. KEMPNER: I object to this question, we are not interested in foreign espionage.

COLONEL NEAVE: I think we are going a little far from the point. Are you discussing the functions of Amt VI

DR. GAWLIK: No, I am discussing the affidavit that was presented concerning the SD Department. I will withdraw my question and ask another question of the witness.

COLONEL NEAVE: If it is relative, we will be glad to hear the question, but try to stick to the point. What is the ~~relationship between the~~ relevance of the question about espionage service in other countries?

DR. GAWLIK: I just wanted to discuss as to whether this department mentioned had as its objective the permitting of crimes against peace or aggression. In my opinion the affidavit was presented to prove a point, but after the objection, I shall ask the question differently.

COLONEL NEAVE: When you talk about an affidavit, is it the affidavit that the prosecution put in today or another affidavit?

DR. GAWLIK: It is today's affidavit put in by the prosecution and presented in cross examination.

COLONEL NEAVE: You may go on, but please make the questions a little more precise.

H0913-0027

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q You know the aims, activities and objectives of Amp 6?

A Yes.

Q Do you know the affidavit?

A Yes, I have seen it.

Q Did this SD office have any special missions beyond the usual capacity of Amp 6?

A This office was only used in a very restricted way and that is to gather information on intelligence concerning the Czech border incident.

Q Did the members of the Inland SD Amp 3 organization know of the missions of this office?

A I hardly think so, because this office only existed for a short time.

Q Did the members of the organization of Amp 6 know of the tasks of this special SD office, or did only the members of the special SD office know of these tasks?

A This office was never mentioned on the organization plan of the SD Main Security Office, as it was used only for a very short time as a collection agency for information and intelligence.

Q I now turn to the second affidavit, submitted today, dated 20 November, 1945. This concerns the manufacturing of explosives. Did this work of manufacturing explosives belong to the tasks, aims and objectives of the Inland organization of Amp 3?

A I already mentioned that this was considered a very special incident by the Criminal Police, because within the entire SD main office there was not a single department for this.

Q You said that the SD had a Service Department or an office in order to

H0913-0028

to carry out actions. What do you mean by the SD here?

A It seems to me that the wording is a bad translation. I wanted to discuss this sentence at the time the affidavit was presented, but it did not seem possible to me then to apply for a change in the sentence.

Q I want to ask you what do you want to say in this sentence?

A I wanted to say where I placed the explosive and where I store the explosive that had been manufactured on the German side.

Q Is that all you wanted to say?

A No, I should like to say further that I wanted to express that I did not know whether this place was a temporary or permanent office of the SD, no Security Police, and the term SD slipped in this connection just as it did in the other connection.

Q Can you, in your experience, answer the question whether the term SD was frequently used for the term SP or Security Police.

A I know that this term was always used concerning the Gestapo and Criminal Police and this was brought about by the shortness of the term SD.

Q Do I understand you correctly that you cannot today say for sure whether this concerned work of the SD or SP?

COLONEL NEAVE: "This concerned work," what do you mean?

DR. GAWLIK: I imagine that this affidavit was submitted to prove that the SD carried out criminal activities in the sense as to what the prosecution wants to prove relative to this witness in the affidavit.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let the witness answer.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

H0913-0029

Q You said the word SD slipped out. Do you want to say that you cannot say for sure whether at that time these activities were activities of the SP or activities of the SD.Before answering the question, read this affidavit.

(The witness is handed the affidavit.)

A There is a contradiction in the German sentence, which says the SD had an office to carry out the activities of the SD. It contradicts itself and I did not notice this contradiction when I signed the affidavit.

Q I imagine it might be an error brought about by translation. I imagine it was translated from German into English and then back into German.

COLONEL JONES: The document which the witness holds in his hand is the original German transcript bearing his signature. It is the same document that the witness read through and signed.

DR. GAWLIK: There is an error of the German construction of the sentence.

COLONEL NEAVE: You have heard the prosecution's statement on the matter, you can proceed.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Can you make a further statement.

A In order to clarify the words as to what I want to say to express that sentence, I would now have to interpret the sentence.

Q Say it.

A The Security Police had an office in this place - of course, the Security Police aids in any of the activities of the SD necessitated in this place.

Q Was this work special work in this SD office?

A Yes, in the first place they were missions for the Intelligence Service.

H0913 - 0030

Q What kind of SD work was this? Internal or Foreign Intelligence Service?

A Foreign Intelligence Service.

Q I had then nothing to do with the aims, tasks and objectives of Amp 3?

A No.

Q Was the work of this office outside the scope of the usual activities of Amp 6?

A No, it was only my own special individual mission, which I was to make out as I was to hand over explosives to Czech troops.

LT. COLONEL BROOKHART: We have covered these questions with this witness in one instance and sometimes twice. Do we have to go over it again?

COLONEL NEAVE: We have dealt with this explosives matter already, have we not Dr. Gawlik?

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I will now turn to the incident at Denmark. First, you spoke of "dirty missions" that you received from Himmler. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Did these dirty missions have anything to do with the aims, tasks and objectives of Amp 3, RSHA?

COLONEL JONES: I object, this is much too wide a question.

DR. GAWLIK: The prosecution brought these questions up, I imagine, as testimony and proof of the activities of the SD, which we are discussing here.

COLONEL NEAVE: You cannot ask a man if his individual mission to do

H0913 - 0031

a dity job had any connection with the aims, tasks and objectives of the SD in general, but you can ask him a more precise question on the same point.

DR. GAWLIK: To be quite frank, I understand the mission was not explained more fully, but I imagine it was submitted here in order to prove that these were missions of the SD.

MR.MONNERAY: I think the witness has admitted the tasks in Denmark consisted of killing people.

DR. GAWLIK: The first gentleman of the prosecution, Colonel Jones, submitted a document where the word, "dirty missions" was used. I do not know if that had anything to do with Denmark. This concerns the affidavit that the witness had made in which he stated he wanted nothing to do with these dirty missions. I do not know if this refers to the incident in Denmark or not. If the prosecution says that is true, I shall confine my questions to that.

COLONEL NEAVE: The prosecution referred to a mission in Denmark and you can ask him about Denmark.

DR. GAWLIK: Did the work that you carried out in Denmark belong to the task, aims and objectives of the Inland organization of Amp 3?

COLONEL NEAVE: You cannot ask him as wide a question as to the tasks, aims and objectives of the SS, when it can clearly not be covered in an answer to a question about an individual mission to Denmark, but you can ask him the connection.

DR. GAWLIK: Do you know the aims, tasks and objectives of the Inland Intelligence organization?

COLONEL NEAVE: In the first place, this cannot be answered in one question. It is an ~~erroneous~~ enormous question.

H0913-0032

COLONEL KAREN: I assume that the witness has said everything he has to say.

DR. GAWLIK: The witness has only testified as to his mission in Denmark. As council for the defense, it is my duty to bring about a connection in these matters.

COLONEL Neave: Well, ask him a precise question on that.

COLONEL JONES: Perhaps Dr. Gawlik does not appreciate the reasons. Certainly whether the aims or purposes of this organization were criminal or not is a matter that the Tribunal can answer and no one can say of their own accord whether it is criminal or innocent, all anyone can do is explain the actions.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, I quite agree there, but I did not ask him if he considered the activities of the SD in any manner, I merely asked him if the activities carried out by him in Denmark belonged to the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: To cut this short - ask him that question.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Then I shall ask the question this way. Did the mission - the activities that you carried out in Denmark - I don't know anything of the individual activities - did these activities belong to the aims, purposes and objectives of the Inland Organization of Amp 3?

A No.

Q Did any office of the organization of the Inland Intelligence, the Office 3 of the RSHA give any orders as to this?

A No, not at all. I have already said that this was a special mission that Himmler charged me with and to which I was forced into.

COLONEL NEAVE: I believe he already answered that question and we are covering the same ground.

H0913 - 0033

DR. GAWLIK: I still have to refer to the matters brought up by the prosecution and I still must ask the witness about Amp. 6.

COLONEL NEAVE: Please don't ask him questions that he has already answered. How long will it take to ask your questions?

DR. GAWLIK: About fifteen minutes.

COLONEL NEAVE: You can ask the questions after lunch. ~~Wxxwiii~~

(A recess was taken at 1300 Hours until 1400 Hours.)

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

H0913-0034

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The Commission reconvened at 1400 hours 24 May 1946).

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Do you want to resume cross-examination?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: I have finished.

ALFRED HELMUT NAUJOCKS--Resumed

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I would like to ask a question yet concerning that affidavit of the 20th November 1945, Number 1 which was entered here. In this affidavit you stated that the SD had agents along the Czech border in every town. Do you want to explain that sentence a little closer, especially what you understand under the word SD in this case?

A Under that I mean agents who were working for the SD or any other part of the security service, people that were very trustworthy and had served in this capacity.

Q Did the SD actually have agents?

A No. At that time I was told the word "Vertranens-leute" which is being used here, the English translation of it was agent, and they were not being paid.

Q Do you realize that under the German word "Agenten" or "agent," another person is understood that is a paid agent?

A I pointed that out for that reason during my inter-

H0913-0035

rogation at that time.

Q I further wanted to ask,was this an organization of "Amt III" or "Amt VI"?

A No clear differences could be made in this case because "Vertranensleute" or agents of the SD might give information which ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ would either concern "Amt III" or "Amt VI."

Q You said yesterday that you belonged to "Amt VI" till the 7th of January 1941. Did you later on belong to any organization of "Amt VI"?

A No. To an organization of the SD or the Reich Security office.

Q In other words, when you did this job, the mission in Denmark, you did not belong to the organization of "Amt III" or "Amt VI"?

A No. At that time I was working for the military government, for the military administration, in Belgium.

Q Are the duties of "Amt-VI-S" which has been mentioned here today known to you? Or don't you know anything exactly about it?

A I cannot give exact information concerning this because I do not know the organization of "Amt VI S."

DR. MERKEL: I would like to ask two questions of the witness concerning this cross-examination.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q I would like to have it stated very clearly of

H0913-0036

the protocol that even though you did have talk with Miller, the chief of "Amt IV", that ~~XXMKXIXX~~ "AMT IV" was in no way connected with the attack on the Gleiwitz radio station.

M. MONNERAY: I object to this question. The witness's answer means in effect whether he has been in touch with the chief of "Amt IV", but we are not interested in the question of whether, according to his conviction, the Gestapo office has been averse to the Gleiwitz incident.

DR. MERKEL: I believe that he can answer it since if he would have talked with the chief of the "Amt IV" he could also say whether or not he had talked with any other members of "Amt IV."

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will allow the question and will let the witness answer it.

DR.MERKEL:
~~XXXXXXXXXXX~~: I just want to make clear that in this case there was just a personal conversation concerning this between Miller and him and not an official conversation in the name of the organization.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The witness may answer.

THE WITNESS: I cannot connect Miller with the Secret Police -- with the organization of the secret police, because I could not find out the action of the secret police during the Gleiwitz incident.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q Were you ever working for the Secret Police, that is, the Gestapo?

A No.

H0913 - 0037

DR. MERKEL: I have no further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Does the Prosecution wish to cross-examine.

(No response).

That is all.

[illegible]

(The Commission adjourned at 1430 hours).

H0913 - 0038

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Alfred Helmut Naujocks, taken on 24 May 1946

Berta D. Price
Reporter (pp 1-16)

Alice Meehan
Reporter (pp 17-32)

H B Darrow
Reporter (pp 33-36)

CERTIFIED TO:

Ann Sheare
Commissioner

x [signature] Lt col
Commissioner

57

H0913-0039

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

FRIDAY, 24 MAY 1946.

COMMISSIONERS:

Colonel A.M.S. Neave.
M. Martin Havard

THE S. D.

(The Commission convened at 1000 hours.)

ALFRED HELMUT NAUJOCKS -- Resumed

CROSS EXAMINATION -- Continued

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q. You told me yesterday that you had seen a copy of a document in prison?

A. I don't believe that it was a document.

Q. Well, when I say a document I don't want there to be any mystery about what the document was. Was that the document you saw?

A. Yes, I believe it was this kind in German.

Q. That appears to have been a copy of the trial brief of the Gestapo. On what date was it that you saw that?

A. That I can't say. I don't remember that part.

Q. Was it long ago or was it quite recently?

A. I don't remember when I saw it, since I am very interested in any kind of papers that were permitted to come over to our section.

Q. But was it a week ago or was it two months ago?

A. With certainty I can not say.

Q. Well, you must be able to tell me approximately how long ago it was when you saw this document?

A. I don't suppose that you ever were in prison and that you have no idea of time.

Q. Was it before Christmas or since Christmas?

A. Since Christmas.

H0913 – 0040

Q. I am going to ask you again and if you refuse to tell me again we can't go any further. Can you say approximately whether it was a week, a month, two months or three months ago that you saw this document?

DR. GAWLIK: I object to this question. I do not think that this question is relevant.

COLONEL NEAVE: I wonder if you can state briefly what is the object of your question? Defense Counsel are rather anxious concerning the documents that they have been given permission to hadn out to witnesses but I don't think they have any connection with your question.

COLONEL FRIFFITH JONES: I am prepared to say, at this particular time, that I am making no objection at all to the fact of his seeing this or any other document.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, that should satisfy you, I think, Dr. Gawlik.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q. Now, are you prepared to tell me when it was you first saw this document?

A. I can not tell you when; I only can tell you whether it was this or that document if you show it to me.

Q. You realized, did you not, before your interrogation in November, that the SD were indicted as a criminal organization?

A. I would like to answer this question explicitly if I may.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Surely he should be able to answer yes or not to that question.

A. I can't do that because I have to answer it explicitly.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q. Did you know or did you not that the SD was indicted as a criminal organization before your interrogation in November?

A. I, for my part, only considered the leadership of the SD as a criminal group, but not the organization as such. By that I mean Himmler and the Gleiwitz episode concerning Heydrich, about which I made these statements.

H0913-0041

Q. I am not asking you what you consider. I am asking you whether you knew that the organization as a whole had been indicted as criminal?

A. Twelve weeks after the 10th of September I came into the witness wing of the prison and there heard for the first time that the organizations, as such, probably would be indicted.

H0913 - 0042

Q And have you since then, together with the other prisoners in the witness wing, been inventing some kind of defense for the SD?

A I did not make inventions but I just took the point of view of telling the whole truth and my conviction.

Q Was it only necessary to tell the whole truth after you found that by what you had said in your affidavit you had incriminated the SD?

A I made this statement, which was the basis of the sworn affidavit of the 20th of November, 1945, at a time when Hitler and Himmler were still alive. My statement or indictment--which I made freely on my own part, -- I make against Himmler and Hitler.

Q You knew perfectly well, did you not, in November, that Himmler was dead and that Hitler was dead?

A Yes, of course I knew that, but the basis for my sworn affidavit were statements which I had made earlier.

Q (By Colonel Neave) You mean you had made a previous statement?

A I made statements earlier and I had to verify these by this swwrn affidavit, since I had made them previously.

Q (Colonel Griffith Jones) Well, I won't pursue that. When you learned that you had been inaccurate in your affidavits about the SD men, what did you do about it? Who did you tell?

A As soon as I realized that, I volunteered as a witness for the defense of the SD.

Q Did nobody suggest that you might come and give evidence for the SD?

A It was a matter of course that I had to, since I was on one side, the part of the prosecution against the SD, that I had to also defend the SD due to the fact that my statement was misunderstood by theprosecution.

Q Very well. Now I want to ask you about another matter. When you made the affidavit on the 20th of November that we have seen, you did, in fact, make two other affidavits as well, did you not?

A I don't know for sure but I believe I made two altogether.

Q Would you look at this document? Does that bear your signature on it?

A Yes.

Q Is that an affidavit sworn to on the 20th of November?

A Yes.

H0913-0043

Q Did you say this -- and I quote from Paragraph 2 -- and this was during the September, 1938: "While in Hof, which is on the Czech border--" I beg your pardon, I ought to start this again. I will start from the beginning of paragraph 1: "In September, 1938, I was working in Amt III of the SD. (The department which was then called Amt III later became Amt VI). In the course of my work I traveled between Berlin, Hof and Munich." Does that appear in your affidavit?

A Yes.

Q "While in Hof, which is on the Czech border, I paid repeated visits to the SD Service Department, that is, Intelligence Office, which has been established there. This Service Department had the task of collecting all political intelligence emanating from the Czechoslovak border districts and passing it on to Berlin. Continuous day and night teleprinter communications had been established from Hof direct to Amt III of the SD in Berlin."

I now will pass to Paragraph 5. "Hof was the center for all intelligence collected by the SD on the Czechoslovak question. The SD had agents all along the border in every town. The names of these agents were reported to Hof, and two motor cars toured the border every day to collect the intelligence which had been unearthed. In addition, I remember that two or three companies of the SS-Totenkopf units were stationed in the neighborhood of Asch."

Now, will you look at this document. Does that document bear your signature?

A Yes.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Are we ready to put these documents in and give them a number?

COLONEL NEAVE: This is one of his affidavits, isn't it?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: And it has not been exhibited before at all?

H0913-0044

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: No.

COLONEL NEAVE: We haven't really discussed it yet, the question of putting in documents before this Commission.

DR. GAWLIK: Then may I ask that I get copies of these documents if they will be used?

COLONEL NEAVE: I think, Colonel Griffith Jones, that before we start putting in documents we must agree on some system by which the defense and ourselves get copies. We haven't really gone into this subject yet at all. Would you prefer to wait and talk that over later before putting in the document?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: We might adopt the same procedure as is adopted before the Tribunal during cross examination, and that is that when the prosecution puts in a document, defense counsel are either given copies at the time or immediately thereafter. I suggest that might be a satisfactory arrangement.

COLONEL NEAVE: How long is this document. Would it take long to translate or is it already in German, the copy?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: That copy I have handed the witness is in German. It could be handed to Dr. Gawlik and I could get another copy.

COLONEL NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, if you take a copy of that document now, will you agree to this procedure providing we number these documents?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: And you will establish a numbering system?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Well, I would suggest that the Commission establish the numbering system.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, I mean the prosecution.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes. Very well, I can do it by conferring with the Court Secretary. I will have to get a block of numbers which we can use.

COLONEL NEAVE: Shall we deal with that afterwards?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: The only fear I have is that unless we do number these documents as we go along we will get confused, so perhaps we could simply call this Prosecution's Document No. 1.

H0913-0045

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, we will arrange the numbering system afterwards. In the meantime, if Dr. Gawlik agrees to this procedure --

DR. GAWLIK: Of course, if this system is used, the Defense too will bring before this Commission sworn affidavits and I hope that there is no objection to that.

COLONEL NEAVE: There is no objection to that. They can do that.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Is that document, No. 2, which I have just handed you, another affidavit sworn to by yourself on the 20th of November?

A Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let me explain to Dr. Gawlik that Colonel Griffith Jones is going to read this copy and then he can have the copy.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q I will read the first paragraph: "From 1934 to 1941 I was a member of the SD. In the winter of 1939 I was stationed in Berlin, working in Amt VI, Chief Sector South East. Early in March, 1939, four or five days before Slovakia declared its independence, Heydrich, who was chief of the SD, ordered me to report to Nebe, the chief of the Reich Criminal Police. Nebe had been told by Heydrich to accelerate the production of explosives which his department was manufacturing for the use of certain Slovak groups. These explosives were small tins weighing approximately 500 grams. As soon as forty or fifty of these explosives had been finished, I carried them by automobile to a small village called Engerau, just across the border from Pressburg in Slovakia. The Security Police had a Service Department in this village for the handling of SD activities." When you realized that you had made an error in you affidavit by talking about SD men and that that phrase incriminated the SD, did you discover any error in what you had said in these two affidavits?

A No. According to my opinion, there was nothing criminal in this representation.

Q If you had been told that what you said in these two affidavits incriminated the SD, would you have been prepared to think out some other explanation to come and give to this Commission?

H0913-0046

A There is no possibility of excusing the SD in this case because the prosecution knows that I know -- they have full information as to what the leadership, the Chief of the Security Office and the SD had done to me. I have to make a difference, though, between the leadership and the organisation, which had

H0913-0047

nothing t do with it.

COLONEL NEAVE: May I just interrupt one minute? This witness really is speaking much too fast. It is very difficult for the court reporters to follow.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q I don't want to interrupt you but we will go on and if you want to add any further explanation you may do so when I have finished. I have one further questionhito ask you which may shorten what you are going to say. On the 12th of September, last year, you were interrogated by Colonel Brundage, were you not? Perhaps I might read to you a passage from a transcript of your interrogatio on that date. You were talking of the work you were doing, fighting the black market in Belgium in 1944, and then you speak of your surrender to the Allies and this is what you have said: "That is why I went voluntarily in October." --

DR. GAWLIK: I object to that. The relevancy here is only questions concerning the activities, duties and actions of the various organizations. Perhaps 4 of the letter of the 13th of March is irrelevant.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: If Dr. Gawlik will allow me to finish reading six lines he will find that this passage effects the activitess and aims of the organization.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let Colonel Griffith Jones finish his reading then.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: "That is why I went voluntarily in 1944 over to the Allies, because I know that after we had to retreat from Belgium, after the war situation, the SS would have got me. I know that because already twice before the SD had tried to get me and give me differnet tasks, but I didn't want to go back to the SS under any circumstances; so then I went over the border to the Allies."

Now on the 9th of October you went further to explain why you did not want to go back to the SS, and I quote now from the transcript of your interrogation of that date: "Normally, now that the job had been terminated, I should have reported to the SS Administrator in order to obtain a new assignment, but I knew that all I would get would be an assignment for more dirty work and I did not want to do that."

And again on the 10th of October, did you say this: "I could be sure that Himmler would again give me some dirty job with the Security Police"?

H0913-0048

A Yes.

COLONEL NEAVE: Colonel Griffith Jones, re this man's adventures eventually going to relate to the activities of the SD?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes, that is the evidence that the SD and the SS were employing this man for dirty work.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Is that correct?

A May I now explain this?

Q Yes.

A The statements of the prosecution prove clearly that I have no reaso to be thankful to the leadership of the Security Service for the SD since I ha nothing but trouble through them. It also proves that with the word "SD" I always meant all the organizations that are connected with the Security Service At that time, I did not specify these differences which are necessary today, and the dirty jobs of which I was afraid, I did not receive from the organization but from Himmler himself and the Chief of the German Security Police, Kaltenbrunner.

Q And did you use the comprehensive term "SD" because all organization connected with the Security Police were working in the closest cooperation wit one another?

A No, I used it as a shortcut. The word "SD", just the word "SD" is us for International Security Detatchment.

COLONEL NEAVE: Beofre the next Prosecutor starts to cross examine, I wou like to make an announcement regarding witnesses for the Gestapo.

(Discussion off the record.)

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q In September 1939, the SD reorganized and certain tasks of Amt III w transferred to Amt VI, isn't that so?

DR. GAWLIK: I object to questions of the reorganization. I have another witness on that and I fear that the answers of the other witness which I have concerning the SD will be declared irrelevant.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, first of all, I am not clear as to the import of your question. Maybe I didn't understand it.

H0913-0049

M. MONNERAY: I wanted to know whether, in September of 1939, certain tasks of Amt III were transferred to the office of Amt VI.

May I answer objection of counsel? Since the witness has been a member of Amt III, according to his testimony, I think it is perfectly permissible to ask him any questions about the organization of which he was a member. Besides, afterwards he was a member of Amt VI also, so that he would be a direct witness on certain questions for the organization of which he was a member.

COLONEL MEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, you asked him questions yourself on this subject of Amt III so I don't see why the prosecution should not cross-examine him on that. So far as the question of what the next witness is going to say, if it is cumulative to what he has said, well, I will leave that to you. I think you discussed Amt III yourself.

DR. GAWLIK: But I only discussed it as far as the witness was concerned and also only as far as the case Kleiwidz. As far as I know, the witness was never in the German Signal Service or the Information Service within the country but always outside the country and, therefore, I doubt very much whether he can give information about the Information branch inside Germany.

COLONEL MEAVE: Well, M. Monneray, will you keep this as short as possible and then we will find out whether he really does know anything.

M. MONNERAY: Yes.

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q Witness, what was the designation for Department VI S of Amt VI?

A At the time I belonged to Amt VI the designation Amt VI S did not exist and evidently was brought about only much later.

Q What was the meaning of Amt VI?

A I only can give information about Amt VI until January 1941.

Q But you just said just now that afterwards you know that Amt VI S was brought about?

A Yes. it was a branch which, so far as I heard, was only made up for war purposes.

Q Is it right that the mission of Amt VI S was sabotage, according to Document 2346 PS. I do not have the exhibit Number.

H0913-0050

COLONEL NEAVE: M. Monneray, what document is being referred to? Is that a document that has been put in by the prosecution?

M. MONNERAY: Yes, the document has been put in but I don't know what the number is.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, I don't think we can expect the witness to remember what it is by the number.

M. MONNERAY: Well, I will show him the document.

A I only heard of the existence of Amt VI S and whatever I say about it are just opinions of my own for which I am not responsible. I only know about the activity of Amt VI S from one case and am not able to give the complete scope of work of that office. Therefore, I cannot make any responsible answers concerning the scope of work by that office.

Q You suggest in your answer that you know about the existence of this office when you got the special mission from Himmler for Denmark?

A That is the one case that I was talking about just now.

Q What did this special mission for Denmark consist of?

A This mission was for me to work as anti-terrorist, to do anti-terrorist activities against the Danish partisans or the Danish resistance movement.

COLONEL NEAVE: Just a minute, M. Monneray. Do you think that this is very relevant, this reference to his individual mission to Denmark?

M. MONNERAY: I think this mission is not an individual mission; I was just coming to the general task of the organization.

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, go on.

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q What were the particular measures to take in Denmark against the resistance movement?

A We always did that but on the smallest scale, what the Danish resistance movement had shown us.

Q What did you do in Denmark?

A We answered the Danish resistance movement with the same measures that they used against German interests.

COLONEL NEAVE: Just a minute, M. Monneray. I am still

H0913-0051

not quite clear what this is leading to. We do want to save time. What has this mission to Denmark got to do with the SD?

M. MONNERAY: The SD had special missions sent into occupied territory in order to fight against the resistance movements. Those missions were --

COLONEL NEAVE: Did this man say he was sent there on behalf of the SD?

M. MONNERAY: He was sent over by Himmler. He said he was not sent alone to Denmark; he was in a group. And he said also that he considered these measures taken in Denmark as a certain kind of reprisal so he got superior orders for the execution of those orders in Denmark. So this action, with the actions of his accomplices, was a political action of the German organizations.

DR. GAWLIK: Himmler had a large number of organizations. Himmler was chief of the SD, was chief of the Police, he was commander of the Replacement Army. The fact that the witness had received the job from Himmler, therefore, does not prove anything concerning the organisation. The prosecution also stated that the group took part, but up to now no mention was made as to the group of the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: Thank you, Dr. Gawlik. I sustain this objection. I heard no reference so far as to the SD on the mission to Denmark. I cannot see the reference in this discussion. I think you should make your questions a little more clear. Will you go on, Mr. Monneray?

MR. MONNERAY: I would like to know first which were the action measures taken in Denmark?

DR. GAWLIK: That is the same question.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let the witness answer. He may say whether or not he knows about this. Please repeat the question.

MR. MONNERAY: What were the measures carried through by the witness and other people working with him in Denmark, according to the orders of Himmler?

THE WITNESS: Only always in answer to the measures that the Danes made against us.

(RECESS)

COLONEL NEAVE: Will you continue, Mr. Monneray?

MR. MONNERAY: When were you in Denmark?

H0913-0052

DR. GAWLIK: I object to further questioning concerning the incident in Denmark, as long as the question has not been settled whether these question concern the actions of Amp. 3 - 6 or 7.

COLONEL NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, I believe we should listen to what the witness has to say.

BY MR. MONNERAY:

Q When were you in Denmark?

A I was in Denmark in 1944.

Q Were you long in Denmark?

A During each visit I was there only a short time, I was there three or four times just a few days and I can only give very restricted information about this.

Q With whom were you in contact in Denmark, insofar as German authorities are concerned?

A May I ask a question in explanation as to the organization?

COLONEL NEAVE: Answer the question.

BY MR.MONNERAY:

A I was in touch with people whose names I do not remember exactly and about whom I do not know, nor do I know if the names given me were their real names or not.

Q At what location did you get in touch with those German people?

A I took up discussions with the manager or director of Amp 6, a man called Skorecony. I told the prosecution when I was asked about this some time ago that the people, like Skorceny, were people belonging to the army and not to the SD.

Q May I make this question clear? Before you went to Denmark, you were told to contact Skorceny, chief of Amp 6-S, is that so?

A There was no such thing as Amp 6-S.

Q Did you not say just before the recess, at the beginning, that you did not know anything about the office of Amp 6?

A I said with one exception and this exception is Denmark.

Q Could you tell us the important sense of the conversation you had with Skorceny?

H0913-0053

A I received an order.

Q Did you ever see Skorceny before?

A Skorceny was not authorized to give me orders. I should like to point out that I was not a member of the SD when Himmler gave me this mission.

Q Why did you see Skorceny?

A Because I did not belong to the SD and as far as I was concerned I did not have a single person at my disposal to help me carry out my orders.

Q Did Skorceny give you any personnel in order to help you to carry through your special task?

A Yes, he did, but these people did not belong to the SD, but to a troop section of the Waffen SS.

Q So, Skorceny did give you personnel?

A Yes, personnel from the Waffen SS.

Q Why did you go to Skorceny and get this help?

A Because those were Kaltenbrunner's orders.

Q Did you tell Skorceny that you got your orders from Kaltenbrunner?

A Yes.

Q Kaltenbrunner was Chief over Skorceny?

A Kaltenbrunner was Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q So, Skorceny had to carry out the orders transmitted by you from Kaltenbrunner?

A I cannot give you any clear answer to that question, as even today I do not know what the status of Skorceny was and if he belonged to the Waffen SS or the SD.

Q Was Department 6-S part of Amp. 6?

A In my opinion there is only one.

Q Six was a part of the SD? Was it?

A Yes.

Q How many people did you get from Skorceny?

A I, personally, did not get any men. These men were led by a man and they were subordinate to the Waffen SS. They were a troop part of the Waffen SS.

Q Your group did not carry out any killings of people?

A In my estimation about one-twentieth of the number of German soldiers killed by the Danes. I can only give an estimate, as I have no definite knowledge.

H0913-0054

Q Your answer is "yes"?

A I have already given my answer.

Q Did you meet Dr. Mildner in Denmark?

A No.

Q Could you give me the names of any German officers in Denmark with whom you had been in touch?

A Yes, but not in relation to these things. I do not know what the question is to mean.

Q That is all.

COLONEL NEAVE: Does the Russian prosecution desire to ask any questions?

RUSSIAN PROSECUTOR: No.

BY LT. COLONEL BROOKHART:

Q I have a few questions pertaining to the examination by the council for t he Gestapo. If I understood you correctly, you stated that no part of Amp 4 RSHA was used in preparing the simulated attack against the Gleiwitz Radio Station?

A I said that no member of Amp. 4 took part in the attack on the Gleiwitz Radio Station.

Q Is it not true that Mildner, Chief of the Gestapo, directed you in part in this task and that you reported to Mueller at his station in Oppen where he instructed you on when and where you would receive the body of the dead man to be used as part of this simulated attack?

A Yes, I said that Mildner was to give me an order that had passed on, that Heydrick was to give an order passed on by Mildner, as to the body of the dead man. I carried through this action without help.

Q But, you did receive the body, according to the plan arranged by Mildner?

A Yes, it was given to me as an order.

Q The question was whether the body was furnished pursuant to arrangements made by Mueller?

A I can give you no precise answer. I was only a witness to a conversation between Mildner and Mueller. I can give you no definite answer as to the part Amp. 4 played in it.

H0913-0055

Q This is the substance of what you testified to before, is it not? You had a conversation with Mueller sometime before the incident, you had previous instructions to call Mueller when you wanted the dead body, using the words "For Canned Goods". Mueller told you you would receive the body at exactly eight o'clock at the broadcasting station in Gleiwitz. You chose the point at which the body was to be delivered. When the signal was given you did receive the man and you laid him down at the entrance of the station. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Those are the facts?

H0913-0056

A Yes, but I cannot place Mueller in direct touch or contact w Amp. 4.

Q What you say now and have said before is your answer to the best of your recollection, is that correct?

A Yes.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Will you please answer my questions only by answerin "yes" or "no" and if I want a declaration, I will ask you for same. If you do not know anything for certain, say you do not know for certain.

The first question relates to the word "SD Man". Does the word "SD Man" mean a man who is on duty in the Intelligence Service in Germany proper - an office which was later carried on by Office 3 of the RSHA?

A No.

Q What does "SD Man " mean? I shall word my question this way, did the word "SD Man" have several different meaning in the language?

COLONEL NEAVE: I thought the witness have already answered this question in the original examination.

DR. GAWLIK: In my opinion, these questions have not been answered quite clearly. May I present the question to the witness in my interpretation of what he has said?

COLONEL NEAVE: Let us have a brief statement as to what the term "SD Man" means, according to the witness.

DR. GAWLIK: I understand the term "SD Man" has several different meanings. First, a man who was on duty in the Inland Intelligence Service, carried out by the organization of Amp. 3. A further meaning of the rerm, "SD Man" was a man who was active in the Foreign Intelligence Service outside of Germany proper, an organization taken over later by Amp. 6. The "SD Man" was further mentioned as members if Amp. 7. That is the meaning of the term applied to "SD Man" according to the bureaus in which they worked. Furthermore, there was an SD of the SS, together with all the members of the RSHA and the members of the SS, or who wanted to become members of the SS, especially also members of the Gestapo and

H0913-0057

the Criminal Police. These so-called "SD Men" have one principle, nothing to do with these specialists. There are four different meanings for the term "SD Man." Furthermore you said that according to Heydrich, the term "SD Man" was also used for a man who was termed as "confidential" or "reliable." If I understood you correctly, you said there were many different meanings for the term "SD Man". Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

LT. COLONEL BROOKHART: This is much too complicated for a single question, at least it cannot be answered in a single answer. A further objection would be that it covers a period during which the witness said he was not a member of the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: He has given quite a clear explanation of what he understands what the witness has said of the interpretation of the term "SD Man". The witness has answere that it is the correct version. I think this has done something to clarify the nature of the term "SD Man". However, Dr. Gawlik, I don't think you should continue in that form, I think you must ask the witness short questions.

DR. GAWLIK: I only put the question in this form, as the witness did not at first understand my question.

COLONEL NEAVE: Go on.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Do you mean to say that the reason for your using the word "SD Man" from a different sense used by the prosecution is due to your different meaning of the word "SD Man?"

A Yes, this is what I tried to explain to the Tribunal yesterday.

Q You did not want to deny that you made use of the term, "SDMan"?

A No.

Q I now refer to the affidavit of 20 November, 1945. This is affidavit for the prosecution No. 1. You said in September, 1938 you worked in Amp. 3. Did this Amp. 3 of the SD have the same aims and objectives of the later Amp 3 of the RSHA?

A No, it had nothing whatsoever to do with them . The exact name of the office at that time was not Amp. 3, it was Central Department

H0913-0058

No. 3.

Q You further said that you visited an SD - Service Department. Was this a department that had the same tasks, aims and objectives of the latter Amp 3 of the RSHA?

A No, it was a department that concerned itself with counter intelligence matters.

Q Did this office have any special aims, or was its activities concerning counter intelligence matters and espionage such as all countries have?

MR. MONNERAY: I don't think the witness can answer any questions concerning foreign matters or countries.

COLONEL NEAVE: Please keep to the point.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Were you employed in the German Intelligence Service abroad?

H0913-0059

A Yes.

Q In your capacity as a member of Amt 6 were you able to get an insight into the foreign espionage of other countries?

A I am quite well informed concerning the espionage agencies in the Balkans, but I am not informed as to the American and English intelligence service.

Q Could you make a comparison...?

DR. KEMPER: I object to this question, we are not interested in foreign espionage.

COLONEL NEAVE: I think we are going a little far from the point. Are you discussing the functions of Amt VI.

DR. GAWLIK: No, I am discussing the affidavit that wa presented concerning the SD Department. I will withdraw my questi and ask another question of the witness.

COLONEL NEAVE: If it is relative, we will be glad to hear the question, but try to stick to the point. What is the relevance of the question about espionage service in other countri

DR. GAWLIK: I just wanted to discuss as to whether this department mentioned had as its objective the permitting of crime against peace or aggression. In my opinion the affidavit wa presented to prove a point, but after the objection, I shall ask the question differently.

COLONEL NEAVE: When you talk about an affidavit, is it the affidavit that the prosecution put in today [redacted] or another affidavit?

DR. GAWLIK: It is today's affidavit put in by the pro ecution and presented in cross examination.

COLONEL NEAVE: You may go on, but please make the quo tions a little more precise.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q You know the aims, activities and objectives of Amt VI

A Yes.

Q Do you know the affidavit?

A Yes, I have seen it.

H0913-0060

Q Did this SD office have any special missions beyond the usual capacity of Amt VI?

A This office was only used in a very restricted way and that is to gather information on intelligence concerning the Czech border incident.

Q Did the members of the Inland SD Amt III organization know of the missions of this office?

A I hardly think so, because this office only existed for a short time.

Q Did the members of the organization of Amt VI know of the tasks of this special SD office, or did only the members of the special SD office know of these tasks?

A This office was never mentioned on the organization plan of the SD Main Security Office, as it was used only for a very short time as a collection agency for information and intelligence.

Q I now turn to the second affidavit, submitted today, dated 20 November, 1945. This concerns the manufacturing of explosives. Did this work of manufacturing explosives belong to the tasks, aims and objectives of the Inland organization of Amt III?

A I already mentioned that this was considered a very special incident by the Criminal Police, because within the entire SD main office there was not a single department for this.

Q You said that the SD had a Service Department or an office in order to carry out actions. What do you mean by the SD here?

A It seems to me that the wording is a bad translation. I wanted to discuss this sentence at the time the affidavit was presented, but it did not seem possible to me then to apply for a change in the sentence.

Q I want to ask you what do you want to say in this sentence?

A I wanted to say where I placed the explosive and where I store the explosive that had been manufactured on the German side

Q Is that all you wanted to say?

H0913-0061

A No, I should like to say further that I wanted to express that I did not know whether this place was a temporary or permanent office of the SD, no Security Police, and the term SD slipped in this connection just as it did in the other connection.

Q Can you, in your experience, answer the question whether the term SD was frequently used for the term SP or Security Police.

A I know that this term was always used concerning the Gestapo and Criminal Police and this was brought about by the shortness of the term SD.

Q Do I understand you correctly that you cannot today say for sure whether this concerned work of the SD or SP?

COLONEL NEAVE: "This concerned work", what do you mean

DR. GAWLIK: I imagine that this affidavit was submitted to prove that the SD carried out criminal activities in the sense as to what the prosecution wants to prove relative to this witness in the affidavit.

COLONEL NEAVE: Let the witness answer.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

H0913-0062

Q You said the word SD slipped out. Do you want to say that you cannot say for sure whether at that time these activities were activities of the SP or activities of the SD. Before answering the question, read this affidavit.

(The witness is handed the affidavit.)

A There is a contradiction in the German sentence, which says the SD had an office to carry out the activities of the SD. It contradicts itself and I did not notice this contradition when I signed the affidavit.

Q I imagine it might be an error brought about by translation. I imagine it was translated from German into English and then back into German.

COLONEL JONES: The document which the witness holds in his hand is the original German transcript bearing his signature. It is the same document that the witness read through and signed.

DR. GAWLIK: There is an error of the German construction of the sentenc

COLONEL NEAVE: You have heard the prosecution's statement on the matter you can proceed.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Can you make a further statement.

A In order to clarify the words as to what I want to say to express that sentence, I would now have to interpret the sentence.

Q Say it.

A The Security Police had an office in this place - of course, the Security Police aids in any of the activities of the SD necessitated in this pl

Q Was this work special work in this SD office?

A Yes, in the first place they were missions for the Intelligence Service.

Q What kind of SD work was this? International or Foreign Intelligenc Service?

A Foreign Intelligence service.

Q I had then nothing to do with the aims, tasks and objectives of Amp

A No.

Q Was the work of this office outside the scope of the usual activiti of Amp 6?

A No, it was only my own special individual mission, which I was to c out as I was to hand over explosives to Czech troops.

H0913-0063

LT COLONEL BROOKHART: We have covered these questions with this witnes in one instance and sometimes twice. Do we have to go over it again?

COLONEL NEAVE: We have dealt with this explosives matter already, have we not Dr. Gawlik?

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I will now turn to the incident at Denmark. First, you spoke of "di missions" that you received from Himmler. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Did these dirty missions have anything to do with the aims, tasks and objectives of Amp 3, RSHA?

COLONEL JONES: I object, this is much too wide a question.

DR. GAWLIK: The prosecution brought these questions up, I imagine as te timony and proof of the activities of the SD, which we are discussing here.

COLONEL NEAVE: You cannot ask a man if his individual mission to do a dirty job had any connection with the aims, tasks and objectives of the SD in general, but you can ask him a more precise question on the same point.

DR. GAWLIK: To be quite frank, I understand the mission was not explain more fully, but I imagine it was submitted here in order to prove that these were missions of the S..

MR. MONNERAY: I think the witness has admitted the tasks in Denmark consisted of killing people.

DR. GAWLIK: The first gentleman of the prosecution, Colonel Jones, submitted a document where the word "dirty missions" was used. I do not know if that had anything to do with Denmark. This concerns the affidavit that the witness had made in which he stated he wanted nothing to do with these dirty missions. I do not know if this refers to the incident in Denmark or not. If the prosecution says that is true, I shall confine my questions to that.

COLONEL NEAVE: The Prosecution reffered to a mission in Denmark and you can ask him about Denmark.

DR. GAWLIK: Did the work that you carried out in Denmark belong to the task, aims and objectives of the Inland organization of Amp 3?

COLONEL NEAVE: You cannot ask him as wide a question as to the tasks, ai and objectives of the SS, when it can clearly not be covered in an answer to

H0913-0064

a question about an individual mission to Denmark, but you can ask him the connection.

DR. GAMLIK: Do you know the aims, tasks and objectives of the Inland Intelligence organization?

COLONEL NEAVE: In the first place, this cannot be answered in one question. It is an enormous question.

COLONEL KAREN: I assume that the witness has said everything he has to say.

DR. GAWLIK: The witness has only testified as to his mission in Denmark. As council for the defense, it is my duty to bring about a connection in these matter

COLONEL NEAVE: Well, ask him a precise qestion on that.

COLONEL JONES: Perhaps Dr. Gawlik does not appreciate the reasons. Certainly whether the aims or purposes of this organization were criminal or not is a matter that the Tribunal can answer and no one can say of their own accord whether it is criminal or innocent, all anyone can do is explain the actions.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, I quite agree there, but I did not ask him if he considered the activities of the SD in any manner. I merely asked him if the activities carried out by him in Denmark belonged to the SD.

COLONEL NEAVE: To cut this short - ask him that question.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Then I shall ask the question this way. Did the mission - the activities that you carried out in Denmark - I don't know anything of the individual activities - did these activities belong to the aims, purposes and objectives of the Inland Organization of Amp 3?

A No.

Q Did any office of the organization of the Inland Intelligence, the Office 3 of the RSHA give any orders as to this?

A No, not at all. I have already said that this was a special mission that Himmler charged me with and to which I was forced into.

COLONEL NEAVE: I believe he already answered that question and we are covering the same ground.

DR. GAWLIK: I still have to refer to the matter brought up by the prosecution and I still must ask the witness about Amp. 6.

COLONEL NEAVE: Please don't ask him questions that he has already answered. How long will it take to ask your questions?

DR. GAWLIK: About fifteen minutes.

COLONEL NEAVE: You can ask the questions after lunch.

(A recess was taken at 1300 Hours until 1400 Hours.)

-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-

H0913-0066

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The Commission reconvened at 1400 Hours 24 May 1946.).

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Do you want to resume Cross-examination?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: I have finished.

ALFRED HELMUT NAUJOCKS**Resumed

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY DR, GAWLIK:

Q I would like to ask a question yet concerning that affidavit of the 20th November 1945, Number 1 which was entered here, In this affidavit you stated that the SD had agents along the Czech border in every town. Do you want to explain that sentence a little closer, especially what you understand under the word SD in this case?

A Under that I mean agents who were working for the SD or any other part of the security service, people that were very trustworthy and had served in this capacity.

Q Did the SD actually have agents?

A No. At that time I was told the word "Vertrauensleute" which is being used here, the English translation of it was agent, and they were not being paid.

Q Do you realize that under the German word "Agenten" or "agent," another person is understood that is a paid agent?

A I pointed that out for that reason during my inter-

H0913-0067

rogation at that time.

Q. I further wanted to ask, was this an organization of "Amt III" or "Amt VI"?

A. No clear differences could be made in this case because "Vertrauens-leute" or agents of the SD might give information which would either concern "Amt III" or "Amt VI".

Q. You waid yesterday that you belonged to "Amt VI" till the 7th of January 1941. Did you later on belong to any organization of "Amt VI".

A. No. To an organization of the SD or the Reich Security Office.

Q. In other words, when you did this job, the mission in Denmark, you did not belong to the organization of "Amt III" or "Amt VI"?

A. No. At that time I was working for the military ogvernment, for the military administration, in Belgium.

Q. Are the duties of "Amt-VI-S" which has been mentioned here today known to you? Or don't you know anything exactly about it?

A. I cannot give exact information concerning this because I do not know the organization of "Amt VI S."

DR. MERKEL: I would like to ask two questions of the witness concerning this cross-examination.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q. I would like to have it stated very clearly of the protocol that even though you did have talk with Miller, the chief of "Amt IV", but we are not interested in the question of whether, according to his conviction, the Gestapo office has been averse to the Gleiwitz incident.

DR. MERKEL: I believe that he can answer it since if he would have talked with the chief of the "Amt IV" he could also say whether or not he had talked with any other members of "Amt IV".

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will allow the question and will let the witness answer it.

DR. MERKEL: I just want to make clear that in this case there was just a personal conversation concerning this between Miller and him and not an offici conversation in the name of the organization.

H0913-0068

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The witness may answer.

THE WITNESS: I cannot connect Miller with the Secret Police -- with the organization of the secret police, because I could not find out the action of the secret police during the Gleiwitz incident.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q. Were you ever working for the Secret Police, that is, the Gestapo?

A. No.

DR. MERKEL: I have no further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Does the Prosecution wish to cross-examine.

(No response).

That is all.

(The Commission adjourned at 1430 hours.)

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Alfred Helmut Naujocks, taken on 24 May 1946.

Berta D. Price
Reporter

Alice Meehan
Reporter

H. B. Darrow
Reporter

CERTIFIED TO:

A.M.S. Neave, Lt. Col.
Commissioner

Armand Martin-Havard
Commissioner